

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Figures 1-6 in the drawings have been amended as shown in the replacement sheets attached hereto.

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, FIGS. 1-6 have been amended as shown in the replacement sheets, claims 1, 9, 11, 19 and 22 have been amended and claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. A Petition for a three (3) month extension of time is being filed concurrently herewith. No new matter is being presented. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 5-29 are pending and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initial Matters Relating to the Outstanding Office Action

As an initial matter, applicant notes that the outstanding Office Action states that it is responsive to the communications filed on June 30, 2004, which predate the filing of the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment on March 18, 2005. This apparent discrepancy seems to account for the Examiner's objection to claim 8, which is believed to be moot in view of the March 18, 2005 filing, as discussed below. When approached about this matter, the Examiner assured the applicant that the most current version of the claims has been considered despite the presence of his objection to claim 8. Accordingly, applicant proceeds upon the assumption that the outstanding Office Action was indeed in response to the filing of March 18, 2005.

Objections to the Drawings:

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to. Accordingly, applicants note that replacement sheets are being filed concurrently herewith and that the drawings include labels of components shown in FIGS. 1-6. Specifically, in FIG. 1, the terms "Subnet", "node" and "controller" have been added and the blocks 6, 7 and 8 have been slightly expanded. The basis for the added text can be found in the PCT Pamphlet on, e.g. page 6, lines 8 - 27. In FIG. 2, the terms "device", "node" and "controller" have been

added and the blocks 35 – 38, 42 and 44 have been slightly expanded. The basis for the added text can be found in the PCT Pamphlet on e.g. page 7, line 12 – page 8, line 12. FIG. 3 has been amended in a similar manner as FIG. 2, i.e. the terms “device”, “node” and “controller” have been added and the blocks 35 – 38, 42 and 44 have been slightly expanded. The basis for the added text can be found in the PCT Pamphlet on e.g. page 7, line 12 – page 8, line 12, and page 11, lines 7 - 9. In FIG. 4, the terms “Processor”, “Receiver”, “Power supply”, “Control means” and “Controllable node” have been added and the blocks 51, 53, 54 and 56 have been slightly expanded in order to comprise the text with the prescribed size. The basis for the added text can be found in the PCT Pamphlet on e.g. page 13, line 29 – page 14, line 18. In FIG. 5, the terms “Processor”, “Receiver”, “Power supply”, “Control means” and “Controllable node” have been added and the blocks 51, 53, 54, 56 and 58 have been slightly expanded. The basis for the added text can be found in the PCT Pamphlet on e.g. page 14, line 20 – page 15, line 2. In FIG. 6, the terms “controller”, “node”, “Power supply” and “device” have been added and the blocks 35 – 38, 42, 44 and 58 have been slightly expanded. The basis for the added text can be found in the PCT Pamphlet on e.g. page 7, line 12 – page 8, line 12 and page 15, lines 4 – 13. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Objections:

As noted above, in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claim 8 was objected to. However, it is believed that this objection is moot in view of the filing of the Preliminary Amendment on March 18, 2005. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections in view of 35 USC 102:

In paragraphs 3-4 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 and 22-29 were rejected under

35 USC 102(b) in view of Frank (US Patent No. 6,026,150). This rejection is overcome.

Briefly, regarding the rejection of claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 now recites a method of transmitting signals to a destination node associated with a device, the destination node being linked to at least two nodes via a communication bus. According to the claim, the method comprises transmitting a signal from a controller using a radio frequency transmission, receiving the transmission signal by the at least two nodes having respective radio frequency receiving configurations, detecting at least a part of the transmission signal that indicates the destination node, selecting a timeslot for each of the at least two nodes for performing a retransmission of at least a part of transmission signal by each of the at least two nodes, and performing the retransmission of at least the part of the transmission signal to the destination node via the communication bus by only the node for which an earliest occurring timeslot has been selected. Here, when a node, for which a later occurring timeslot has been selected, detects the reception of the retransmission signal, the later timeslot node aborts a retransmission of the signal therefrom.

Calling specific attention to the recitation of the selecting of the timeslot and the performance of the retransmission, applicant notes that these features are not shown in the cited reference to Frank, which discloses retransmitting a control signal from a remote control that is received by a speaker to e.g. a tuner via a telephone line, using a modem connection. That is, Frank does not describe a situation in which more than one speaker receives the control signal, and all then try to retransmit the control signal, leading to collision and/or retransmittal of redundant control signals, etc. As such, Frank certainly does not disclose the claimed solution for such an situation.

That is, applicants submit that Frank contains no disclosure of "selecting a timeslot for each of the at least two nodes for performing a retransmission of at least a part of transmission signal by each of the at least two nodes" or of "performing the retransmission of at least the part of the transmission signal to the destination node via the communication bus by only the node for which an earliest occurring timeslot has been selected."

Furthermore, Frank does not disclose that "when a node, for which a later occurring

timeslot has been selected, detects the reception of the retransmission signal, the later timeslot node aborts a retransmission of the signal therefrom.”

Here, it is noted that, on page 4, lines 4 – 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Frank discloses that when a “transmission signal is received by at least two nodes ... the retransmitting step is performed only by the node for which an earliest occurring timeslot has been selected.” As evidence of this disclosure, the Examiner relies upon FIGS. 1 and 2.

Applicant disagrees with this analysis. Initially, it is noted that FIGS. 1 and 2 of Frank do not disclose anything of relevance to the claimed feature. Further, while Frank may disclose termination of certain transmissions (see cf. col. 9, lines 39 -- 44 in Frank), such a scheme does not include the feature that only the signal, for which an earliest timeslot has been selected, is retransmitted.

Thus, it is believed that claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the reference. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

Regarding the rejections of claims 9 and 22, it is noted that these claims recite similar features as claim 1 and that, therefore, the rejections of these claims are overcome for similar reasons as set forth above.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2-8, 10-21 and 23-29, it is noted that claim 4 has been cancelled and that the remaining claims depend from claims 1, 9 and 22, respectively.

Thus, the rejections of these claims are either moot or overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Rejections in view of 35 USC 103:

In paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Frank. However, since claim 21 depends from claim 1, it is believed that the rejection of claim 21 is overcome for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, all of the outstanding objections and rejections are believed to have been addressed and answered. It is therefore believed that the application is in condition for allowance and an action to that effect is respectfully requested.

As noted above, applicant hereby petitions for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Response.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By:



Howard Levy
 Registration No. 55,378
 CANTOR COLBURN LLP
 55 Griffin Road South
 Bloomfield, CT 06002
 Telephone: 860-286-2929
 Facsimile: 860-286-0115
 Customer No. 23413

Date: September 6, 2007